



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1459
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/828,447	04/20/2004	Markus Mertama	KOLS.107PA	4001
7590 Hollingsworth & Funk, LLC Suite 125 8009 34th Avenue South Minneapolis, MN 55425				
04/08/2008				
EXAMINER				
RODRIGUEZ, LENNIN R				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2625				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
04/08/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/828,447

Applicant(s)

MERTAMA ET AL.

Examiner

LENNIN R. RODRIGUEZ

Art Unit

2625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 April 2004.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 20 April 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-893)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/26/2004, 10/06/2005
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

(1) page 3, line 21, "wireless transceiver **124** may utilize" should be -- wireless transceiver **122** may utilize --.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-3, 11-15, 18 and 23-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hisatomi et al. (2002/0171857).

(1) regarding claims 1, 13, 25 and 26:

Hisatomi '857 discloses a data processing device (100 in Fig. 1), comprising
a transceiver (112 in Fig. 1, paragraph [0070], lines 1-3 and paragraph [0075],
where the outer interface is performing the job of a transceiver); and
a processing unit (114 in Fig. 1, and paragraph [0054]) coupled to the transceiver
(bus 116 in Fig. 1) configured to define at least one compressed image file in a
definition file written in a markup language (paragraph [0040], lines 1-4, paragraph

[0044], lines 6-9, paragraph [0049], where a file is being added to the definition file that is in a markup language), to print document data into the compressed image file (paragraph [paragraph [0048]-[0049], where a print document is being processed into a definition file), and to transfer the definition file and the compressed image file with the transceiver to a printer capable of interpreting the definition file and printing the compressed image file, whereby the document data is printed (paragraph [0064], where the files are been sent for printing along with print data information (definition file).

(2) regarding claims 2 and 14:

Hisatomi '857 further discloses wherein the processing unit is further configured to include in the definition file a reference to the compressed image file (paragraph [0040], lines 1-12 and paragraph [0043], where the information about print data contains a reference to the print file).

(3) regarding claims 3 and 15:

Hisatomi '857 further discloses wherein the processing unit is further configured to include in the definition file information on the decomposition of the document data into the compressed image files (paragraph [0066], where the rasterizer decompress the image data).

(4) regarding claims 11 and 23:

Hisatomi '857 further discloses wherein the processing unit is further configured to receive an image request from the printer via the transceiver (paragraph [0070], lines 1-3) and to transfer the compressed image file via the transceiver to the printer in response to the received image request (paragraph [0075]).

(5) regarding claims 12 and 24:

Hisatomi '857 further discloses wherein the processing unit is further configured to generate the compressed image file after the image request for it has been received (Fig. 2, where the generation of the compress file S1600 is done after the request for it S1200).

(6) regarding claim 18:

Hisatomi '857 further discloses printing the document data into the compressed image file in two stages including the printing of the document data into a bit map file and converting the bit map file into the compressed image file (paragraph [0066]).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 4, 9, 16 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hisatomi et al. (2002/0171857) in view of Henry et al. (US 6,538,766).

(1) regarding claims 4 and 16:

Hisatomi '857 discloses all the subject matter as described above except wherein the processing unit is further configured to paginate the document data, to split each

page of the paginated document data into bands having a predetermined width and height, and to print each band into the compressed image file.

However, Henry '766 teaches wherein the processing unit is further configured to paginate the document data (page divider 2 in Fig.4), to split each page of the paginated document data into bands having a predetermined width and height (column 5, lines 27-30), and to print each band into the compressed image file (column 5, lines 49-55).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made wherein the processing unit is further configured to paginate the document data, to split each page of the paginated document data into bands having a predetermined width and height, and to print each band into the compressed image file as taught by Henry '766 in the system of Hisatomi '857. With this, the invention aims to provide a method and device or conversion into bit-map mode which allows processing by band, whilst minimizing the memory size necessary for storing the data in the course of processing (column 1, lines 39-42).

(2) regarding claims 9 and 21:

Hisatomi '857 discloses all the subject matter as described above except wherein the processing unit is further configured to divide the document data into compressed image files not exceeding a predetermined size limit.

However, Henry '766 teaches wherein the processing unit is further configured to divide the document data into compressed image files not exceeding a predetermined size limit (column 5, lines 17-23, where the predetermined size limit is one page).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made wherein the processing unit is further configured to divide the document data into compressed image files not exceeding a predetermined size limit as taught by Henry '766 in the system of Hisatomi '857. With this, the invention aims to provide a method and device or conversion into bit-map mode which allows processing by band, whilst minimizing the memory size necessary for storing the data in the course of processing (column 1, lines 39-42).

6. Claims 5-6 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hisatomi et al. (2002/0171857) in view of Nielsen (US 6,199,080).

(1) regarding claims 5 and 17:

Hisatomi '857 discloses all the subject matter as described above except wherein the processing unit is further configured to print the document data into the compressed image file in a what-you-see-is-what-you-get or WYSIWYG fashion.

However, Nielsen '080 teaches wherein the processing unit is further configured to print the document data into the compressed image file in a what-you-see-is-what-you-get or WYSIWYG fashion (column 3, lines 14-21).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made wherein the processing unit is further configured to print the document data into the compressed image file in a what-you-see-is-what-you-get or WYSIWYG fashion as taught by Nielsen '080 in the system of Hisatomi '857. With this, the user makes sure that the information he wants would be the information he gets, thus making the system user-friendlier.

(2) regarding claim 6:

Hisatomi '857 further discloses wherein the processing unit is further configured to print the document data into the compressed image file in two stages including the printing of the document data into a bit map file and converting the bit map file into the compressed image file (paragraph [0066]).

7. Claims 7-8 and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hisatomi et al. (2002/0171857) in view of Takayanagi (US 5,168,371).

(1) regarding claims 7 and 19:

Hisatomi '857 discloses all the subject matter as described above except wherein the processing unit is further configured to delete the definition file after it has been transferred to the printer.

However, Takayanagi '371 teaches wherein the processing unit is further configured to delete the definition file after it has been transferred to the printer (column 5, lines 60-68 and column 6, lines 1-9, where the parameters are been interpreted as part of a definition file).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made wherein the processing unit is further configured to delete the definition file after it has been transferred to the printer as taught by Takayanagi '371 in the system of Hisatomi '857. With this, a picture image processing system that insures the security of picture image datafiles by prohibiting any unauthorized person from accessing stored picture image datafiles (column 1, lines 58-62).

(2) regarding claims 8 and 20:

Hisatomi '857 discloses all the subject matter as described above except wherein the processing unit is further configured to delete each compressed image file after it has been transferred to the printer.

However, Takayanagi '371 teaches wherein the processing unit is further configured to delete each compressed image file after it has been transferred to the printer (column 5, lines 60-68 and column 6, lines 1-9, where the picture image datafile are been interpreted as the compressed image file).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made wherein the processing unit is further configured to delete each compressed image file after it has been transferred to the printer as taught by Takayanagi '371 in the system of Hisatomi '857. With this, a picture image processing system that insures the security of picture image datafiles by prohibiting any unauthorized person from accessing stored picture image datafiles (column 1, lines 58-62).

8. Claims 10 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hisatomi et al. (2002/0171857) in view of Dimperio et al. (US 5,142, 667).

(1) regarding claims 10 and 22:

Hisatomi '857 discloses all the subject matter as described above except wherein the processing unit is further configured to generate the compressed image file after the previous compressed image file has been transferred to the printer and deleted from the processing unit.

However, Dimperio '667 teaches wherein the processing unit is further configured to generate the compressed image file after the previous compressed image file has been transferred to the printer and deleted from the processing unit (column 13, lines 57-68, where the image files are been deleted after been processed and printed and then a new compressed file can be generated).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made wherein the processing unit is further configured to generate the compressed image file after the previous compressed image file has been transferred to the printer and deleted from the processing unit as taught by Dimperio '667 in the system of Hisatomi '857. With this, the system would save memory space, thus saving computer resources necessities or that may be needed for other processes.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LENNIN R. RODRIGUEZ whose telephone number is (571)270-1678. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday 7:30am - 6:00pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, King Poon can be reached on (571) 272-7440. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2625

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/King Y. Poon/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625

Lennin Rodriguez
3/31/08